

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/626,476	07/23/2003		Paul W. Skinner	021028-000120US	1328
37490	7590	12/01/2005		EXAM	INER
CARPENT 1900 EMBA		•	NGUYEN, DINH Q		
SUITE 109	KCADEN	O KOAD	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PALO ALTO	D, CA 9	4303	3752		

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Juli				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/626,476	SKINNER, PAUL W.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dinh Q. Nguyen	3752				
The MAILING DATE of this commu Period for Reply	nication appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communities. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum sometimes are reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a amunication. statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI by will, by statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on 25 August 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☑ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/s 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restr	are withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by t						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including 11) The oath or declaration is objected	ng the correction is required if the drawing to by the Examiner. Note the attache	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies</li></ul>	y documents have been received. y documents have been received in A s of the priority documents have beer ional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 of Paper No(s)/Mail Date	(PTO-948) Paper No	s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/626,476

Art Unit: 3752

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 35-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall. III in view of Otten et al.

Hall, III discloses a vegetation dispensing device comprising: a conduit 190 with a channel 195 (see figure 14), an outlet 232 for conveying a substance 206a-c, a sensor 200 for sensing growing conditions and communicated with the conduit 231 via controller 10 (see figure 15), a flow control 205 for regulating an amount of substance, a microprocessor control system 10, the plurality of sensors such as soil moisture, ground temperature, ion concentration (as disclosed in column 15, lines 34-60). Hall, III does not disclose the sensor being coupled to the conduit. However, Otten et al. discloses a fluid control device with fluid flowing conduit 23 with sensor 137 couple to the conduit 23 for sensing flowing conditions and relay signals to processor 37 (see figure 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to configure the device of Hall, III with a sensor being coupled to the conduit as suggested by Otten et al. Doing so would provide a way to control fluid dispensing within the system (see Otten's column 1, lines 29+)

Application/Control Number: 10/626,476 Page 3

Art Unit: 3752

With respect to claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53, Hall, III in view of Otten et al. do not disclose expressly the sensors such as leaf wetness sensor, insect sensor, DNA sensor, sugar accumulation sensor, pheromone sensor or protein sensor etc. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Hall, III device with the above sensors, because Applicant has not disclosed that the above sensors provides an advantage, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any of the above sensors because they provide a way to monitor a condition of vegetation. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Hall, III and Chaplinsky to obtain the invention as specified in claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53. Furthermore, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Hall, III and Otten et al. device with any type of sensors (see Hall, III column 15, lines 43-45).

## Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 35-57 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 3752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on 571-272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dinh Q Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3752

dqn